

FROM COURTYARD FNT DESK

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
(MON) JAN 10 2005 21:00/ST. 21:00/No. 6804450324 P 1
JAN 10 2005

PTO/SS/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0851-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

17ax

Application Number

09/879,884

Filing Date

January 10, 2004

First Named Inventor

REZAI, AHMAD (OVLCE)

Art Unit

2863

Examiner Name

Douglas N Washburn

Attorney Docket Number

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)



Fee Transmittal Form



Fee Attached



Amendment/Reply



After Final



Affidavits/declaration(s)



Extension of Time Request



Express Abandonment Request



Information Disclosure Statement



Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)

Reply to Missing Parts/
Incomplete ApplicationReply to Missing Parts
under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53

Drawing(s)



Licensing-related Papers



Petition

Petition to Convert to a
Provisional Application

Power of Attorney, Revocation



Change of Correspondence Address



Terminal Disclaimer



Request for Refund



CD, Number of CD(s) _____

☐ Landscape Table on CD

After Allowance Communication to TC

Appeal Communication to Board
of Appeals and InterferencesAppeal Communication to TC
(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)

Proprietary Information



Status Letter

Other Enclosure(s) (please identify
below):

Remarks

TO USPTO
FAX (703) 872-9306

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name

Signature

Printed name

Date

Reg. No.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name

Date

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Remarks

A

Please be advised that in the latest Office Action Summary sent to me on 10 November 2004, one of the remarks is simultaneously referred to as "4 January 2004" on page one and "4 January 2003" on page 2. Being as such, I'm not exactly sure what is being referred to. Please provide me with copy of this remark which you state that I did not sign; I would be more than happy to sign it.

B

Within, please find the original copy of the fax received by your offices dated 10 December 2002 that I am signing and resubmitting to you for entry. It challenges the points raised by examiner. In summary, GPS RTK is well within centimeter potential; it has been long before I ever submitted either a provisional or non-provisional patent application. It needs be noted that there are current off-the-shelf products that are within millimeter potential. Ever since its inception many products (e.g. photo cameras) that incorporate GPS technology have made use of "GPS Stamps" (e.g. photo location of mass graves) but no instrument remains to date that is for this sole purpose (i.e. a GPS3M).

i

C

I wish to comply with the request of the office in regards to the disclosure, namely the specific request for change of the following:

Page 1, line 12 "Stipe", Examiner suggests "strip"

Page 3, line 17 "space x Time"; Examiner suggest "space-time"

Page 5, line 4 "Log"; Examiner suggests "log"

I am herein correcting these to the examiners suggestion and submitting it along with these remarks.

D

An objection was raised with regards to the abstract, and I wish to comply with the examiners request and am changing the abstract as advised to the following:

"A spatial-temporal tracking stamp system, GPS3M, enables users to assign a unique number for tracking and/or positioning purposes. The system provides a simple mode of recording and retrieving information based on coordinates in space and time. The system, with a high degree of accuracy, ease and reliability, measures and stamps location and time using alphanumeric symbols or digitization."

Please find the correction in accord to the examiners suggestion enclosed within and signed.

E

The Claims Objections that the examiner raises is also not objected to. Examiner suggests the use of the term "unique" in lieu of "unreplicable" in claim 1, line 1 and claim 2, line 2; I am changing this as to the examiners request. Please find the correction submitted within and signed.

Examiner suggests that the quotation for the term "fingerprint" in claim 1, line 1 and claim 3, claim 3, line 1 are unnecessary. Whereas the use of the term "fingerprint" can commonly be used by many in the GPS industry, I wish to comply with the examiners request of omitting the use of the term "fingerprint" in the stated claim 1, line 1 and claim 3, line 1. Please find the corrections enclosed within and signed.

Claim 1, line 2. Examiner suggests "refinement of Global" to "refinement of a global"; I am herein complying with the examiners request. I will make the stated correction and submitting it, signed.

Claim 2, line 1; examiner suggests "the parties of interest" should be replaced with "users". I am herein complying with the examiners request. I will make the stated request for correction and submitting it, signed.

Claim 2, line 5; Examiner suggests "computer-scanable" should be replaced with "computer-scannable". I am herein complying with the examiners request. I will make the correction and am submitting it hercin, signed.

iii

And claim 4 line 3; Examiner suggests " (i.e. a common language) is redundant and ought to be omitted. I am herein complying with the examiners request.

I will omit this statement and submit it herein, signed.

Remarks (Part II)

1. The proposed GPS3M (Global Positioning System Signature Stamp Machine) is not an obvious extension of existing inventions or products, as examiner claims. The proposed machine to date does not exist. If it is so obvious an invention, why does it to date not exist?

2. Value of GPS3M has been noted in prior communications. Examiner cites the Want et al. system as an invention that already exists which takes the place for the function of the discussed GPS3M. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Want et al. system (e.g. the cited Figures 6-8 and their corresponding explanations) amounts to nothing more than a very general Yellow Page / Guidebook of public inquiry.

3. GPS3M is very different from the Want et al. system in that it is a highly precise means for tracking personal, private or public variables of interests. Where the Want et al. system via its stated means would be able to reference and describe the Patent Office Building, the GPS3M System would be able to distinguish each and every brick that went into it and by whom. In the example used, the purpose of the Want et al. system is generic recognition of public facilities whereas that of GPS3M is providing a unique fingerprint for each and every component that goes into a building, from a light switch, to a file cabinet, a chair, a refrigerator shelf - where and when they were inserted, moved and by whom. The Want et al. system does not attempt to make any such fine determination for fingerprinting and tracking. As no such machine exists to date,

the evidence very much suggests that it is not so obvious an invention as the examiner proclaims.

4. Illustrating further, using the GPS3M an architect can with this technology review each and every component that would go into a new building and with a builder/contractor be able to verify each and every component for quality and trouble-shooting in case a component does not meet up to expectations. Say a building component (e.g wooden ceiling beam) did not behave as anticipated. By scanning the encoded building material, the architect, builder or homeowner can very quickly communicate to the source of the component exactly where and when this particular component failed to meet expected standards. Was it installed with correct screws, installed by personnel of builder who is not experienced - was it a personnel problem in supervising that particular component or a raw materials source problem? Each and every piece that goes into building a home may be coded and tracked immediately and in subsequent years for correct/optimal replacement. A homeowner many years thereafter interested in the sale of this property can demonstrate that meticulous care went into any needed repair-work. The value for such a machine (GPS3M) is unquestionable, and its current lack of existence acts very much as evidence in support of my patent. GPS3M within the confines of the used example has hundreds of thousands of possibilities, if not billions. With Want et al. it has one.

5. The uniqueness and potential of GPS3M is remarkably different than anything referenced by the patent examiner, including the system proposed by Want et al. The crux of GPS3M as proposed is one of logging and referencing items as they relate to both time and space. System by Want et al. in no way

compares to patent 09/879,884 - the ability to stamp and track items in time and space with remarkable precision, following its development in time (e.g. from Japanese forest lumber into furniture manufacturing facilities in Norway, into showroom floor in Seattle, into someone's home in New Zealand).

GPS3M is a utility unlike any other. In fact nothing like it exists to date that offers anyone, corporate or consumer, to make use of a stamp for fingerprinting items, places, situations of value - to assign a permanent unique code. In the instances where the stamping of both time and coordinates is possible, not only are the increments not as fine as that proposed by GPS3M but they are of a general and non-specific nature, and for use as part of some system the consumer has to purchase that has nothing to do with exclusive use of stamping for ciphering and deciphering of information alone. Nothing in existence today proclaims the discussed valuable utility, GPS3M. Nothing. If a consumer seeks to track something he or she may desire, assign it a permanent unique number for personal or professional use, what are his or her options? Very few indeed. GPS3M is a stamp to that end and deserves consideration for patent. Contrary to the claims of patent examiner, the Want et al. DOES NOT provide a unique code. It provides a code that can be replicated infinitely because anyone occupying those coordinates can produce the exact same numbers under the Want et al. system. The proposed GPS3M system is at opposites with accomplishments of the Want et al. system in that it proposes a unique and unreplicable fingerprint for any form of matter for use in identification and tracking. Using the Want et al. system a permanent unique number will not be assigned to items in time-space. Want et al. system attempts to make very general points

of discovery, whereas GPS3M system proposes a unique fingerprint that cannot be replicated.